

1 HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
15 AT TACOMA  
16  
17

18 DENNIS R. HOPKINS,  
19 Plaintiff,

20 v.  
21  
22 TACOMA MUNICIPAL COURT, et al;  
23 TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al;  
24 TACOMA POLICE OFFICERS, et al; JEFF  
VAZURA, et al; CHUCK WEST, et al; and  
KEITH O'ROURKE, Tacoma Police Officer,  
25  
Defendant.

Case No. C07-5621RBL

ORDER

18 DENNIS R. HOPKINS,  
19 Plaintiff,

20 v.  
21  
22 LEONARD W. KRAUSE, et al; JUDGE,  
23 SUPERIOR COURT OF KITSAP COUNTY,  
e al; STEPHEN J. HOLMES, Jr. Deputy  
Kitsap County; MARK LI YELISH, Court  
Appointed, et al; BREMERTON POLICE  
DÉPARTMENT, et al; ELAINE FRALEY, et  
al; and ARTHUR J. POLEY, et al,  
24  
Defendants.

Case No. C07-5638RBL

ORDER

26 THIS MATTER comes on before the above-entitled Court upon Plaintiff's Second Application to  
27 Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* [Dkt. #5]. Having considered the entirety of the records and file herein, the Court  
28 finds and rules as follows:

1 On November 9, 2007 plaintiff filed an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* and a Proposed  
2 Complaint [Dkt. #1]. On November 13, 2007 this Court entered an Order informing the plaintiff that his  
3 application was “incomplete.” The Order went on to state: “Plaintiff states he is employed but the salary  
4 information is undecipherable and plaintiff does not provide the name of his employer. Plaintiff also indicates  
5 that he receives SSI benefits but does not disclose the amount.” [Order, Dkt. #2].

On November 14, 2007 the plaintiff submitted a second Application. In this Application, he now indicates that he is not employed, but does not provide the required information as to his last employment and the wages or salary therefrom. He does indicate that he receives \$623.00 in SSI benefits. Furthermore, on November 16, 2007 plaintiff submitted an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* and a separate Complaint against different defendants. [*Hopkins v. Krause, et al*, C07-5638RBL]. That Application suffers from the same defects as the second Application in C07-5621.

12 The Court finds that plaintiff has failed to file proper affidavits of indigence and, as such, plaintiff's  
13 Applications to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* in C07-5621RBL and C07-5638RBL are **DENIED**. All pending  
14 motions are hereby **STRICKEN**. Plaintiff shall have thirty (30) days to pay the filing fees or these two cases  
15 will be **DISMISSED**.

## **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 The Clerk shall send uncertified copies of this order to all counsel of record, and to any party appearing  
18 pro se.

19 Dated this 13<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2007.

Ronald B. Leighton  
RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE